



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/19/3230296

Land adjacent 4 Newcombe Drive, Arnold, Nottingham NG5 6RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andy Bellfield against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0128, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new three bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in an area characterised by modern semi-detached houses. Whilst there are differences in design between individual properties they are generally of a similar age and style to No 4 Newcombe Drive (No 4), with shallow roof pitches and wide windows giving a strong horizontal emphasis to the design. The houses are generally well set back from the street behind front gardens with reasonable gaps between the pairs of houses, giving the area a spacious feel.
4. I acknowledge that this is not the only style of housing in the area, and examples of more recent developments can be found in the surrounding streets. However, where different styles of houses are present, they tend to be grouped together rather than appearing as individual dwellings. Groups of newer houses in the area form their own distinct character areas and do not form part of the immediate context in which the appeal site is viewed. This is the case with the more recent houses on the other side of Newcombe Drive, which are visually separated from the appeal site by a play area and amenity space.
5. The proposed development would provide a new detached dwelling in land that was previously the side garden of No 4. The new dwelling would be different in design to the adjacent semi-detached properties, with a narrower frontage, higher ridge and larger roof plane with front and rear dormers. The size and position of the windows would add to a more vertical design emphasis, contrasting with the adjacent properties and resulting in the new dwelling

- appearing awkward and out of character. Whilst I agree with the appellant that it is not necessary for new development to be of a 1970's style for it to be acceptable, it should nonetheless have regard to its context with a design that sits comfortably within its setting.
6. The new dwelling would project further forward on the plot than No 4. The appellant has commented that this reflects the 'stepping' of the dwellings immediately to the east along Newcombe Drive. However, the gap between the proposed house and No 4 and is significantly smaller than that between Nos 4/6 and Nos 8/10 so the stepping does not continue the rhythm of this short section of the street. This forward projection and the narrow gap would emphasise the difference in design and height between the proposed development and the neighbouring properties, making the new dwelling appear more prominent in the street and contributing to the harm to the character of the area.
 7. Planning permission was granted for an identical proposal in 2015 but that permission has now lapsed. Since the previous decision, the Gedling Part 2 Local Plan 2018 (LP) has been adopted and the revised National Planning Policy Framework 2019 published (the Framework). I note the appellant's assertion that the policies on design in the LP are no more strict in their approach to assessing character and appearance than those in the previous local plan. However I have assessed the proposal in terms of the policies now before me and am not bound by the Council's previous decision.
 8. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy 2014, which requires that development makes a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place, having regard to the local context.
 9. Policy LPD 34 of the Gedling Part 2 Local Plan 2018 sets out the requirements for development involving loss of residential gardens. Even if it is accepted that the proposal would represent a more efficient use of land at a location where higher densities are appropriate and would therefore comply with part ai), the proposal fails on criteria b) which requires that all development should not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and the street-scene. The proposal also fails to comply with Policy LPD 40 which requires housing development on unallocated sites to be of a high standard of design. For similar reasons it also conflicts with the design objectives contained in Chapter 12 of the Framework.
 10. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Rosie Morgan

INSPECTOR